

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending. The Office Action dated April 21 2004 regarding this Application has been carefully considered. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10, and 12-22 have been determined by the Examiner to be in condition for the allowance. Applicant thanks the Examiner.

The Examiner has stated that the title of the invention is not descriptive. (Office Action, page 2.) In response, Applicants have amended the title to state “N-Way Pseudo Cross-Bar *Having an Arbitration Feature* Using Discrete Processor Local Busses”. (Emphasis Added.) Applicants respectfully request that the Examiners objection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks for those Claims not considered being in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,070,205 to Kato *et. al.* (Kato). Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is deemed overcome.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, “*a first gating logic coupled to the first master for receiving the first arbitration request and the first address information from the first master, and coupled to the first bus arbiter for providing the first arbitration request to the first bus arbiter; and a second gating logic coupled to the second master for receiving the second arbitration request and the second address information from the second master, and coupled to the second bus arbiter for providing the second arbitration request to the second bus arbiter.*” (Emphasis added.) Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in FIGURE 2 and page 5, line 2 to page 6, line 5 of the original Application.

As discussed with the Examiner during the interview of July 16, 2004, Kato does not disclose, teach, or suggest Claim 1 as amended above. Specifically, Kato discloses, teaches or suggests one or more bus master requesting bus access at the same time, the bus arbitrator determines which bus master accessing the bus according to selected priority order information. However, there is no detail in Kato to suggest cross-barring of address busses, such as through the employment of the first gating logic and the second gating logic. In use of cross-barring, simultaneous read and/or write operations are enabled..

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kato be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 5, 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kato. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is deemed overcome. Claims 5, 7 and 11 depend upon and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the dependent Claims 5, 7 and 11 also be withdrawn.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Kato in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796, 413 to Shipp et al. ("Shipp"). Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is deemed overcome. Claim 7 depends upon and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the dependent Claim 7 also be withdrawn.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kato. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is deemed overcome. Applicant contends that the rejection of amended Claim 23 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include Kato not disclosing, teaching, or suggesting “*a first gating logic coupled to the first master for receiving the first arbitration request and the first address information from the first master, and coupled to the first bus arbiter for providing the first arbitration request to the first bus arbiter; and a second gating logic coupled to the second master for receiving the second arbitration request and the second address information from the second master, and coupled to the second bus arbiter for providing the second arbitration request to the second bus arbiter.*” (Emphasis added.) Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended Claim 7 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference:

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-23.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: 7/21/04  
CARR LLP  
670 Founder's Square  
900 Jackson Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
Telephone: (214) 760-3030  
Fax: (214) 760-3003

Alan A. R. Cooper  
Alan A. R. Cooper  
Reg. No. 51,217